

**COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
AGENDA ITEM TRANSMITTAL**

(1) DEPARTMENT Administrative Office & Planning and Building	(2) MEETING DATE 10/4/2016	(3) CONTACT/PHONE Lisa Howe, Administrative Office / 781-5011 Ryan Hostetter, Planning and Building / 781-5600	
(4) SUBJECT Request to receive and file an update on affordable housing in San Luis Obispo County. All Districts.			
(5) RECOMMENDED ACTION It is recommended that the board receive and file an update on affordable housing and provide staff direction regarding future items for the Planning Department priority report.			
(6) FUNDING SOURCE(S) N/A	(7) CURRENT YEAR FINANCIAL IMPACT \$0.00	(8) ANNUAL FINANCIAL IMPACT \$0.00	(9) BUDGETED? Yes
(10) AGENDA PLACEMENT <input type="checkbox"/> Consent <input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Hearing (Time Est. ____ ) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Board Business (Time Est. <u>120 Minutes</u> )			
(11) EXECUTED DOCUMENTS <input type="checkbox"/> Resolutions <input type="checkbox"/> Contracts <input type="checkbox"/> Ordinances <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A			
(12) OUTLINE AGREEMENT REQUISITION NUMBER (OAR) N/A		(13) BUDGET ADJUSTMENT REQUIRED? BAR ID Number: <input type="checkbox"/> 4/5 Vote Required <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N/A	
(14) LOCATION MAP N/A	(15) BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT? No	(16) AGENDA ITEM HISTORY <input type="checkbox"/> N/A    Date: <u>November 17, 2015</u>	
(17) ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE REVIEW This item was prepared by the Administrative Office.			
(18) SUPERVISOR DISTRICT(S) All Districts.			

# County of San Luis Obispo



TO: Board of Supervisors

FROM: Lisa Howe, Administrative Office / 781-5011  
Ryan Hostetter, Planning and Building / 781-5600

DATE: 10/4/2016

SUBJECT: Request to receive and file an update on affordable housing in San Luis Obispo County. All Districts.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

It is recommended that the board receive and file an update on affordable housing and provide staff direction regarding future items for the Planning Department priority report.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **Background**

Pursuant to Title 29, the Board considers making adjustments each year to the in-lieu fee schedule and housing impact fee schedules of Title 29 – Affordable Housing Fund. Title 29 fees are better known as the affordable housing “in-lieu” fees. These fees are collected when construction permits are issued by the Planning & Building Department. The fees are used to support affordable housing projects. In 2008, both Title 29 and the inclusionary housing ordinance were adopted with a five-year phase-in schedule. The intent of the phase-in period was to allow time for the housing market to adjust to the ordinance and recover from the recession. However, both the ordinance and the fee schedules have remained at “Year 1” since 2008.

On November 17, 2015, the Board approved the Planning and Building Department’s recommendation that the Title 29 fee schedules continue to remain at “Year 1” of the five-year phase-in period. At this time, the Board also directed staff to bring back a discussion addressing options of increasing affordable housing and what the County can and cannot do.

### **Housing Update**

The purpose of this update is to provide the Board an overview of the county’s current housing market, encompassing both single-family homes and multi-family units. As stated in the County’s Housing Element of the General Plan (2014-2019), the chronic undersupply of housing affordable and suitable for locally employed persons has economic, social, and environmental impacts. This situation warrants coordinated public and private actions to facilitate more housing affordable to local residents. Providing an adequate supply and range of affordable housing choices is a high priority and a significant challenge in San Luis Obispo County.

The Administrative Office in conjunction with the Planning and Building Department developed the attached report that assesses the current housing situation, provides an overview of current County efforts and provides a list of potential policy alternatives. Specifically, this report provides a definition of affordable housing, presents housing supply and market trends, and reviews past assessments of housing needs in the County. The report also identifies current adopted County policies, programs and ordinances, and presents information from neighboring counties and cities of their efforts to facilitate the building of affordable housing. Lastly, impact fees from neighboring jurisdictions were gathered and compared to current fees collected by the County.

Changes in the following key variables affect affordability: housing prices, interest rates, and income. Though these three key variables are the primary factors that determine housing affordability, this report only focuses on the role the County can play in facilitating and developing affordable housing as it relates to housing prices and does not look at policies related to interest rates or income. While the County does provide funding to support economic development activities and job creation through the nonprofit Economic Vitality Corporation (EVC) and the SLO HotHouse, we will table the discussion of economic development as it relates to affordable housing for a future date.

The following sections provide a summary of the key components of the attached report.

### **Housing Costs**

San Luis Obispo County is much like any other county in California, where the cost of housing is not affordable for many people in the community. Housing in California has long been more expensive than most of the rest of the country. As of early 2015, the typical California home cost \$437,000; more than double the typical U.S. home (\$179,000). The median sales price of a house in San Luis Obispo County in 2015 was approximately \$484,000. When comparing to other counties in California, the median sale price of \$484,000 in San Luis Obispo County ranked as the eleventh highest in the state in 2015. When comparing coastal counties in California, home prices in San Luis Obispo are \$100,656 lower than the average of \$584,656 and ranks in the lower half of the range in median sale prices. Although prices are high in San Luis Obispo, home prices and rents do vary widely throughout the county. In 2015, Avila Beach had the highest median sale price at \$822,000, while Shandon had the lowest at \$243,000.

### **Housing Affordability**

The term “affordable housing” refers to housing that households can rent or buy while keeping housing costs within certain limits. Housing is generally considered affordable if total housing costs do not exceed 30% of household income. Multiple indices for measuring housing affordability exist; however, the price to income ratio is the basic affordability measure for housing in a given area. According to the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) Housing Opportunity Index (HOI), the San Luis Obispo – Paso Robles – Arroyo Grande metropolitan area ranked 228 out of 236 in the nation and 64 out of 72 in the west region in affordability during the first quarter of 2016. In other words, during the first quarter of 2016, the San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles-Arroyo Grande area ranked as the eighth least affordable area in the State.

The California Association of Realtors analyzed how much home a median-income household can afford and the disparity between home prices and what is affordable in certain counties across California in 2015. The analysis assumes a down payment of 20 percent of the median home price and a 30-year fixed-rate mortgage with a rate set on the prevailing mortgage interest rate. Twenty-five of the 32 reporting California counties had a higher median price than the actual home price that a household earning a median income could afford. San Luis Obispo County was one of the 25 counties that had a higher median price than the actual home price that a household earning a median income could afford by \$180,837 or 56.8%. Based on the median home price, the median income would have to increase by \$35,752 to \$98,712 in order to reduce the disparity between home prices and what is affordable. The attached report includes a table showing how San Luis Obispo compares to other areas of the state.

### **Housing Needs in the County**

There are a variety of reports and surveys throughout the county focusing on housing needs. The attached report outlines key takeaways from some of these reports including, SLOCOG Regional Housing Needs Plan, Housing Element – Housing Needs Assessment, and the EVC Workforce Housing Study.

The County’s Housing Element includes a comprehensive analysis of housing needs addressing trends and interrelationships between people, economics, and the housing stock. Chapter 5 addresses trends and interrelationships between people, economics, and the housing stock. Page 5-1 of the Housing Element includes the following seven general conclusions drawn from this information.

- *Although home prices declined significantly between 2006 and 2011 and housing in San Luis Obispo County is relatively more affordable than five years ago, home sales prices are still beyond the financial reach of most existing residents.*

- *Resource limitations, especially water, continue to impact housing development and where it may be located.*
- *The county's population is growing older. The housing supply will need to accommodate those changing needs with housing that is safe, walkable, and bikeable to transit stops, nearby medical services, and shopping.*
- *As the household size declines, the need for relatively smaller homes may rise.*
- *Attached housing is a viable option for many residents. It is generally developed at higher densities with lower land cost per housing unit. Projects should be close to services and provide useable open areas and other amenities.*
- *It is becoming more important to find opportunities to provide housing to locally-employed persons. When people live closer to work, school, shopping, and other destinations, they consume less energy, contribute less to traffic congestion, reduce infrastructure costs to the County, reduce personal travel expenses, and improve overall quality of life by having more free time.*
- *Locally employed persons would prefer single family detached housing if they can afford it (based on the recent Workforce Housing Study by the Economic Vitality Corporation).*

### **Current Policies, Programs & Ordinances Related To Housing**

Local government can play a major role in facilitating and developing affordable housing, but it is important to remember that some factors are beyond policy makers' control. A high demand to live in the county, natural limitations on developable land, and environmental requirements are largely beyond the control of local policy makers. As a result, home prices and rents in San Luis Obispo likely will remain above-average for the foreseeable future.

The County Department of Planning and Building prepares policies and programs as they relate to land use and future growth for the County Board of Supervisors review and adoption. These policies and programs are within the County's adopted General Plan, and those specifically related to housing are within the County's Housing Element of the General Plan. The department plays a key role in the process of providing housing and affordable housing through implementation of the County's General Plan, and allocation of Housing and Community Development (HUD) grant programs to fund affordable housing units. For the purposes of this study session staff has prepared an overview of all the applicable components for both affordable and market rate housing that the Planning and Building Department has jurisdiction over. These documents include the County's Housing Element and Draft Fair Housing Plan, which both provide policies, programs, and action steps with recommendations to address housing. In addition, there are adopted ordinances related to the creation and preservation of existing affordable housing. A summary is provided below.

- **Housing Element Programs**
  - Program: HE 1.C: Reduce and Defer Fees for Affordable Housing Development
  - Program: HE 1.D: Provide Incentives for Construction of Secondary Dwellings
  - Program: HE 1.E: Farm Support Quarters and Group Quarters
- **Draft Fair Housing Plan (at the Board of Supervisors for adoption this fall):**
  - Ease Procedural Barriers to Multi-Family Housing Development.
  - Fully Implement the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (Title 29).
  - Support Reforms to the California Coastal Act in Order to Facilitate Affordable Housing Development in the Coastal Zone.
- **County Ordinance and Programs examples:**
  - Density Bonus (Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Section 23.04.090 and Land Use Ordinance 22.12.040) allow for design concessions if affordable units are included in project
  - Avila Beach Specific Plan – Inclusion of Studio Unit required with multi-family construction.
  - HOME Investment Partnership Program - HOME grants fund construction of new affordable units, and rental vouchers to keep those who are in immediate risk of becoming homeless.

Establishing a basic level of understanding of what San Luis Obispo County does, and how the County compares across neighboring jurisdictions is a part of the information compiled. Neighboring jurisdictions included in our research are: Santa Barbara County, Monterey County, and Ventura County, as well as the seven cities within San Luis Obispo County: Arroyo Grande, Atascadero, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, Paso Robles, Pismo Beach, and San Luis Obispo. Additional jurisdictions, which had successful programs not found locally, were analyzed.

The County compiled in-lieu, impact, and building fees associated with the building of both single family and multi-family dwellings. Staff also gathered and compared development fees from neighboring jurisdictions. Generally city's overall development fees cost higher than the County's, but this was largely attributed to county housing units obtaining their own potable water and waste water management systems (i.e. well, local water purveyor and septic). Furthermore, although the square footage of the single-family dwelling unit and multi-family dwelling unit were assumed to be equal, five out of the eight jurisdictions had cheaper rates per unit for the multi-family dwelling unit. This is not the case for the County of San Luis Obispo, as the single unit cost for multi-family dwelling is about \$679 more than a single-family dwelling unit.

### **Potential Policy Solutions**

After reviewing all the existing policy documents, other jurisdiction information, and conducting outreach, County staff compiled a list of potential policy solutions. The County's adopted Housing Element contains many of the policies and programs that could be implemented, and all of them contribute to the facilitation of more housing development for both affordable and market rate units. Much of the outreach with stakeholders along with research of other jurisdictions revealed that through implementation of additional programs outlined in the Housing Element the County could successfully further the development of housing. These potential policy solutions are highlighted in Section 9 of the attached report and all categorized into sections related to permitting and processing, zoning, fees, density/size, and special housing types.

In the last section, *9.7 Recommended Potential Policy Solutions on Which to Focus*, County staff narrowed down some of these items into specific suggestions which could be considered in the near term, and some items that the Board should consider adding to the Planning Department priorities report with further information in the future (long term items). These items can be separated into more immediate action items or those which take more time and are much more resource intensive and involve multiple jurisdictions/agencies for review and approval. The table lists those which are more immediate (I – within one year), short term (S – within approx. 1-3 years) and then long term (L – more than 3 years) as referenced in the table below. These items rose to the top because of support from the outreach efforts, information within the adopted Housing Element and items that would be easier to implement in a timeframe, which is not extended (i.e. updating fee schedule, which occurs yearly).

### **County Permitting Processing**

- *Matrix for discretionary vs. ministerial for ease of use by developers* – This option came out of the report provided by the Home Builders Association (HBA), the Economic Vitality Commission, and the San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce. This option is a short term and administrative option which asks that the Department of Planning and Building work with the HBA on an easy to use matrix which shows developers and the public which projects or applications are ministerial versus which are discretionary. According to the Home Builders there can be issues or confusion with regards to knowing when something requires discretionary approval. While the County currently has this information in the land use ordinances (for example table 2-2 and coastal table "O") the ordinances would be used as a baseline for an informational sheet or matrix in an effort to make these easier to use and add a layer of predictability. There may be issues with regards to interpretation of specific projects in special cases, which could not be resolved within this matrix, and those special projects would continue to need further review by staff and ultimately determinations by the Planning Director and Planning Commission if necessary.

### **Zoning and Land Use**

- *Designate additional land for residential uses* – This option is from the suggestions outlined in the Home Builders Association / Economic Vitality Commission / San Luis Obispo Chamber report prepared for the County. This report contains suggested policy solutions that the County could pursue in an effort to facilitate the construction of housing in general, however mostly market rate housing. This option is also listed in the County's adopted Housing Element of the General Plan. While increasing supply by designating more residentially zoned land

would help build more housing, this option does not come without it's own set of issues. This option would be long term and would require finding resources for which there is room for growth with regards to water and infrastructure. Even though resources in our County are scarce, this option remains as one of the primary ideas to focus on because it is an important piece of the supply side of the puzzle. This option would involve long term discussions with multiple agencies and extensive in depth research which would be time consuming and require many County resources to conduct. This option would also not necessarily directly impact the facilitation of "affordable" units but may only increase the local supply of market rate housing (unless there are components of projects that either build "affordable" units or pay in lieu fees for this purpose which is possible).

- Create a new Mobile Home Park land use category – This policy option is outlined within the adopted Housing Element and provides another avenue for which housing could be supported for additional affordable units, and is one that could potentially be accomplished within an approximately 3 -5 year timeframe. The county has 40 mobile home parks which supply approximately 2,500 units which are more affordable than the majority of the market rate units. By creating a separate land use category (zoning district) for this purpose not only would the County assist with preservation of current parks from conversion, but the County could facilitate the addition of more mobile home parks. These could also include revised standards to potentially incorporate trending housing types such as "tiny homes" so long as they comply with state codes such as the Building Code.
- Expand Multi-Family Residential Zoning – This policy option is listed within the adopted Housing Element as well as the draft Fair Housing Plan. There is overlap with regards to designating and zoning more land for residential uses. This option however specifically calls out land designated for multi family purposes. Many of the issues related to resource and land supply as shown above with regards to expanding or upzoning property exist here as well (i.e. resource constraints such as water and roadways). This is another long term item (i.e. more than 3 years to implement) that could be investigated as it relates to future growth and planning for our expanding populations.
- Add housing in the business park and industrial properties – As technology changes and the need for historic office parks or industrial space changes this provides an opportunity to revisit these separate land use categories, and see if there is opportunity for adding additional housing within these areas. While other areas in the state may contain more large office parks, there are some areas within our County that are zoned for office and industrial (approximately 1,900 acres of land is zoned industrial while approximately 180 acres are zoned office) which could be investigated. There are issues, however, with compatibility of uses such as an industrial uses being close to a residential use which would need to be looked at very closely. However, there is room and opportunity within here to potentially add residential units to a land use category which previously excluded them (other than a caretaker unit). This option would take investigation and public outreach efforts which may be longer term and therefore is listed as a long term item for which the County could allocate resources toward further investigation.
- Sphere of Influence Expansion – The County is a partner in discussions regarding amending the City's boundaries as well as amending boundaries for service districts within the County. The County could assist with facilitation of further long term discussions about where future growth areas exist. This policy option was pointed out within the Home Builders Association / EVC / San Luis Obispo Chamber report as a suggestion to pursue. This option similar to zoning more land (for which there is overlap), contains similar issues with regards to community support and availability of resources. The County would need to engage in long term discussions with many agencies including the cities and the Local Agency Formation Commission. As a part of this effort, the County would need to engage in discussions regarding the resources needed to plan for future expansion due to increases in population as well. The Board reviews the Resource Management System (RMS) annually which provides the data needed to evaluate the current state of the County's resources and would need to be potentially revised in order to facilitate more construction. The RMS could be further expanded to investigate expansion of resources to help facilitate residential expansion areas (i.e. investigate desalination as an option to support growth).
- Management of short-term vacation rentals - The County currently has an adopted vacation rental ordinance in the Coastal Zone which regulates some of the neighborhood issues that are brought up by the community such as parking, noise etc. There are also standards specific to distance requirements in between vacation rental units in an effort to not oversaturate a neighborhood with vacation rentals. Currently however, there are provisions in which the distance requirements could be waived through a Minor Use Permit and several have been approved

since the adoption of the vacation rental ordinances. There is an opportunity to amend these ordinances and revisit the distance requirements to further limit the number of vacation rentals within residential neighborhoods. It is also possible to include similar standards within other areas of the County outside of the Coastal Zone.

## Fees

- Reduce, waive and defer fees for affordable housing/ Fees Scale to Unit Size – This option is supported by many stakeholders and is also included with the Housing Element. The County has a lot of room to update and improve its fee process and include more flexibility for builders of smaller units, scale fees to unit size, and the timing for when fees must be paid. Deferring the fees could be helpful for developers because they would not need to finance all of the building and impact fees up front within the construction loan process. The role of the County is different than that of a City because the County does not have control over many of the fees such as water or sewer connections which vary based on district. Other fees such as school fees are also set by the respective school districts and not the County Board of Supervisors. The County, however has the ability to amend or defer the timing of payment for the building permit fees, road fees (through Public Works), and impact fees in an effort to allow builders to phase the submittal later in the process. Amending impact fees would need additional review and study as they relate to specific infrastructure needs which vary throughout the County. .
- Fully Implement the County's Inclusionary Housing Ordinance for affordable housing – Currently Title 29 (Inclusionary Housing Ordinance) is in year one of the fee structure which was set up to be a gradual implementation from adoption in year 2012. Much of this is due to the recession, and the Board opted to not increase the percentages during this time. The Board however could revisit the fee program and ask that a larger percentage be collected while the economy is strong, and the County could provide additional funding directly toward the construction of affordable units. Much of the funding from this program is competitively leveraged by many of the non profit affordable housing builders in an effort to supplement their proforma. The non profit affordable housing builders apply for very competitive tax credits for which the County's in lieu fees are a key component. A Title 29 update is scheduled to be back before the Board before the end of the calendar year.
- Regional Approach to Infrastructure Funding – This policy option was outlined in the report from the Home Builders Association / EVC / and San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce. This suggestion asks the County to look into options such as Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (EIFD), to fund infrastructure such as roadways to remove this financial burden from the homebuilders. While these funding strategies are not without controversy, there is room for investigation of financing options such as the EIFD's to help with some infrastructure costs. An EIFD essentially captures enhanced tax revenue from an area which has been improved to pay back a loan or bond that is issued to complete those improvements. There are specific legal requirements for forming an EIFD including obtaining voter approval, establishing the boundaries for the district or area of need, establishing the legislative body that governs the EIFD and putting together infrastructure financing plans which are to be adopted by the Board. Investigating these financing tools are listed as a longer term work effort in staff's report.

## Density & Unit Size

- Accessory / Secondary Dwelling Units allowed in more zoning districts and flexible standards – There is room within the code to increase flexibility for secondary dwelling units in an effort to encourage the construction of more units which provide both value and marketability to an existing property, as well as another unit for either rent or an aging family member. Currently there are strict standards regarding the parcel size and the distance for which a second unit could be allowed. These ordinance requirements could be revisited and potentially amended to allow for more flexibility for the construction of these units. This policy option is listed in both the adopted Housing Element as well as our survey efforts and is shown as a short term item (approx. 3 years to implement).
- Increase Density within Multi-Family Districts/ Require minimum density – Similar to the option above with regards to expanding land zoned for multi family residential, this option would include upzoning existing multifamily districts which could come with similar issues such as resource constraints. This option could additionally come with significant neighborhood issues as many of our communities which have existing multi family property would not look favorably upon adding density within their communities. This could be a long term effort which would require extensive input and outreach with the communities in an effort to show what types of projects would be allowed and what projects could look like at certain density levels. A lot of education would be needed for this

option, as well as investigation into where current multi family land exists, at what current density, and overlay that with water and infrastructure availability.

#### Special Needs Housing Type

- Review existing ordinances for possible amendments to Farm Support Quarters, group homes (Residential Care Facilities) and senior-friendly communities – While this policy suggestion does not directly address some of the items brought up by the Home Builders Association or the general public at large, there is however a lingering (and very important) issue with regards to supply of farm worker housing, as well as housing for our aging populations. The Department of Planning and Building and the Board have been informed about issues regarding supply of farmworker housing, specifically those workers on temporary work visas (H-2A Visa). This along with studying issues regarding location and supply of housing for aging populations contribute to the overall housing discussion as specific housing types are needed for large segments of our populations. This policy option could be investigated within an approximately 3 year timeframe for implementation dependent upon community support and outreach efforts.

#### Other

- Napa County Proximity Housing Homebuyers Assistance Program/First Time Homebuyer Program - The County of San Luis Obispo no longer has a first time homebuyer program because the funds were expended and were not renewed by the State. There is a program which started in Napa County which is a proximity program that essentially provides down payment support of up to 10% for people who qualify and who are commuting long distances to work in Napa's business centers. The purpose of the program is to promote affordable workforce housing, while reducing greenhouse gasses and commutes for people who work in Napa County. An eligible applicant must work in the County of Napa and the applicant's total household income can not exceed 120% of Napa County's median income for the household size. In the case of the County, the only other large community that is outside of the county that people commute from is Santa Maria in Santa Barbara County. To apply this locally, boundaries within our county would need to be established in the places where people drive to affordability. This policy option is listed here as one to investigate which is in the short term (approximately 1-3 years).
- Increase Sales Tax or Transient Occupancy Tax for affordable housing – There are other options which could be investigated for supplementing funding of affordable units. This is not unlike the discussions related to funding infrastructure improvements (such as the upcoming half cent sales tax on the ballot), and while funding from the State and Federal governments are being reduced for affordable projects (HUD funding for HOME has been halved in the last few years), these tools provide supplemental funding to allow the County to pay for affordable housing projects. This option is one that is long term and would take research and outreach in order to accomplish.
- Golden State Financing Authority (Expand Awareness) – The County is currently a member of the Golden State Financing Authority which is a financing organization that provides several options for residents to participate in programs from down payment to loan assistance. The program, formerly called the California Homebuyers Fund (CHF) is available through local lenders for the public to participate in their programs for which they qualify. Currently this program is not widely used throughout the County, however there may be opportunity for additional education and/or outreach in an effort to expand awareness of these programs for which the County is a member.

#### OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT

The County Administrative Office, Department of Planning and Building, and County Counsel coordinated in the preparation of this item. County staff also conducted multiple outreach efforts, including an online survey to housing industry professionals (architecture, planning, building, non-profits, education, real estate or other related fields), as well as the distribution lists of the Home Builders Association, Economic Vitality Corp and SLO Chamber of Commerce. The San Luis Obispo Home Builders Association, the Economic Vitality Corp, and the San Luis Obispo Chamber of Commerce also submitted a document called "Housing Policy Solutions" to County staff. The document proposes multiple policy ideas to address the need for more housing in the county. The County engaged in discussions with members of the HBA, EVC and the Chamber on the areas where the County should focus updates and implementation of new

ordinances.

To determine how San Luis Obispo County housing development programs compare to other jurisdictions, staff examined other jurisdiction's housing elements, zoning codes, and county websites. Jurisdictions looked at included Santa Barbara County, Monterey County, Ventura County, Sonoma County, and Napa County, as well as the cities within San Luis Obispo County: Arroyo Grande, Atascadero, Grover Beach, Morro Bay, Paso Robles, Pismo Beach, and the City of San Luis Obispo. Additional jurisdictions were looked at from out of the area which had successful programs that were not found locally.

### **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

There is no additional funding requested as part of this update. If the Board of Supervisors directs staff to continue exploring a specific policy alternative, resource needs will be determined.

### **RESULTS**

Receipt of this item will provide the Board will a high level overview of the housing affordability in the county, current policies, programs, and ordinances related to housing, and potential policy solutions available for facilitating and developing affordable housing.

Given the current and anticipated impacts of affordable housing on the community, discussion and direction to staff is consistent with the County goals of promoting a safe, healthy, livable, and well-governed community.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1 – Affordable Housing – Policies and Programs  
Attachment 2 – Survey Executive Summary and results  
Attachment 3 – EVC/HBA/Chamber - Housing Policy Solutions